

**REMARKS**

On May 13, 2009, the Examiner issued an Election/Restriction Requirement for Applicants to elect one of the following groups of pending claims for examination:

I. Claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 52-53 drawn to a method and device for decrypting superdistributed content, classified in class 705, subclass 51.

II. Claims 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18-21 drawn to a device for requesting and receiving an encrypted key, classified in class 380, subclass 277.

III. Claims 22, 25-31, 34-44, 46, 47, 49 drawn authorizing an agent to act on behalf of a distributor, classified in class 726, subclass 16.

IV. Claims 50-51, drawn to distributing television broadcast content, classified in class 725, subclass 31.

Examiner Sherr and the undersigned attorney discussed revising the grouping of claims and on August 17, 2009 agreed with the following revised claim groups:

**Group I:** Combine claims from original Group I and original Group II - i.e. the combined claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 52-53 and claims 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18-21.

**Group II:** Eliminated.

**Group III:** Combine linking claims 14, 16, 18-21 from original Group II with original Group III - i.e. the combined claims 14, 16, 18-21 and claims 22, 25-31, 34-44, 47, 48, 49

**Group IV:** Claims 50-51.

The Applicants hereby elect for examination **Group I: Combine** claims from original Group I and original Group II - i.e. the combined claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 52-53 and claims 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18-21.

**This election is made with traverse.**

The Applicants wish to traverse the requirement of restriction by averring that if the linking claims 14-21 are allowable, then Groups I and III can be rejoined, under MPEP 809. In addition, the Applicants reserve the right to rejoin Group IV to the other Groups I and III, since the Applicants believe that claims 50-51 are linking claims and are allowable. The Applicants aver that MPEP 809 requires rejoinder of Groups I, III, and IV if the linking claims are allowable.

Moreover, the Applicant respectfully submit that: (1) all groups of claims are properly presented in the same application; (2) undue diverse searching should not be required; and (3) all claims should be examined together. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction/election requirement should be withdrawn and an action on the merits of all the claims is respectfully solicited.

In view of the above, the Applicants further reserve the right to file appropriate divisional applications based on any or all of the non-elected claims.

**AUTHORIZATION**

Accompany this paper is a Petition & Fee for Extension of Time. No additional Fees are believed to be necessary. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for timely consideration of this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4827, Order No. 1004289-133US (4208-4143).

Respectfully submitted,  
Locke, Lord, Bissell & Brook LLP

Dated: October 13, 2009

By:



---

John E. Hoel  
Registration No. 26,279  
(202) 220-6900 Telephone  
(202) 220-6945 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

Locke, Lord, Bissell & Brook LLP  
Customer No. 85775  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101